

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLTURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on September 12, 2006.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Ricardo Montano, Chairman
Legislator Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chairman
Legislator Cameron Alden
Legislator Jon Cooper
Legislator Vilorio•Fisher

Legislator Daniel P. Losquadro
Legislator Jay H. Schneiderman

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer William J. Lindsay
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk
Gail Vizzini, Director of Budget Review Office
Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director of Budget Review Office
Robert Lipp, Deputy Director of Budget Review Office
Bob Martinez, Aide to Legislator Montano
Mike Cavanaugh, Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Ben Zwirn, Assistant Deputy County Executive
James Dahroug, County Exec's Office
Tom Vaughn, County Exec's Office
Peter Quinn
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

(THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 9:45 AM)

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

I'm going to start the meeting of the Budget and Finance Committee and call the meeting to order. We'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Alden.

(SALUTATION)**CHAIRMAN MONTANO:**

Thank you. I believe we have one •• do we have a clerk here? We have the stenographer. We can go, right? We have one speaker. That is Mr. Pete Quinn. And his topic is disclosure. Pete, welcome back.

MR. QUINN:

Oh, I usually speak loudly enough anyway. I have been concerned for quite sometime about public disclosure of financial information by the full Legislature and by the Budget and Finance Committee. I haven't in the past been able to obtain from Budget Review such things as energy costs; broken down into a single page. Where I received information about the total energy cost paid for facilities, the total cost for paid for sewer plants. And from the

Suffolk County Water Authority, the total cost for pumping stations of which there are an excessive 400. And frankly, I don't see that data provided any longer in a, you know, in a comprehensive way but with brevity.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

May •• may I interrupt you?

MR. QUINN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

You said you don't see it •• and I'll stop the clock. You said you don't see it any longer?

MR. QUINN:

I used to be able to obtain that information when I went directly to the Budget Review Office.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay, thank you. Go ahead, Pete.

MR. QUINN:

But, it just seems to me prudent that not only energy but the industrial development agency where there are perks given to businesses. And if that were totally summarized and saying have to reading two or three hundred pages of an annual report and then not precisely find all the information you're looking for, it would be helpful to the public to better understand what you do as Legislators. Similarly, the capital expenditures for the year. Or the bonding that is undertaken and what the interest rates are on those bonds and for how long.

If those were summarized into •• I mentioned four or five things now; if you had maybe two pages for each one and they were made available to the public, more and more people would better understand how our Suffolk County government works. And I just think it would be prudent. I know you decided as a general Legislature not to go on television. But perhaps maybe we can televise this kind of program •• committee and enable the public even when they don't come to the Legislature to better understand how our government works.

And I just a •• as one who is a believer in participatory democracy, I certainly think it would be useful either to put that information on the internet in an abbreviated fashion or to provide print outs for public use. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Quinn. Before you go, could you just stand there a second?

MR. QUINN:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

I just want to be clear that you're not implying that we're somehow not giving this information today when we were in the past. Are you?

MR. QUINN:

Oh no. No.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. QUINN:

The difficulty •• I've always had a great deal of difficulty obtaining the kind of information that, you know, I'm kind of a strange individual who likes to see the crunch the numbers. But I find it's difficult. And I don't think I should have to go through a lengthy process to find information or file freedom of information act forms.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Let me ask ••

MR. QUINN:

I •• I think some of that information should be made available to the public through Legislative offices or being made through the Budget Review Office.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Let me ask Budge Review. Do you have any •• I'm not really aware of this on a in depth basis. I believe that the information that Mr. Quinn is referring to is available. I'm not sure in what context or at what time. But at some point I believe it is available. Am I •• am I mistaken in that?

MS. VIZZINI:

I can certainly appreciate the request for things in a simplified manner. And I'll be happy to talk with you in terms of what it is you're looking for. It's challenging for us to put things in a simplified manner. But I'll be glad to talk to you and see if we can come to some agreement.

MR. QUINN:

In the •• on the energy issue, for example, I was •• Fred Pollert reduced things to a one page form to tell me how much energy costs were at facilities, all the buildings throughout Suffolk County. At the Water Authority, for the pumping stations, and for the sewer districts. So that you had a compilation in one year and the preceding year so you could see how much energy costs had gone up for example. And I don't see that anymore.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Pete, we'll take a look at what the request is and, you know ••

MR. QUINN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

•• and you could follow up with me on a •• follow up with me and we'll look into it. I'm not sure what was given to you or what Mr. Pollert is doing. That's really the Executive Office.

MR. QUINN:

No. Well, this was when he was in charge of BRO.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

All right. We'll look into it. Thank you very much.

MR. QUINN:

I appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Is there anyone else that would like to address the Budget and Finance Committee? Hearing none, we're going to get right into the •• oh, I apologize. Gail, I believe you circulated a memo here on filled positions and payroll projection. Does everyone have •• has everyone received a copy?

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay. Gail would you like to address the Committee with respect to the memo? Maybe just outline what we're •• what you have in front of us.

MS. VIZZINI:

Sure. I just wanted to let you know that we are expecting the 2007 operating budget at the end of the week, Friday. And I just wanted to give you a highlight of the status in terms of positions.

Overall the number of active employees has actually increased by 140 from the beginning of the year. A lot of this attributable to a net increase in terms of the hiring of the police class of 100; and the hiring of 50 correction officers. A significant increase is the 55 correction officers, as I said, 46 employees in Social Services. A net increase of 21 in the DA. However the Labor Department is down 21 employees.

In the General Fund our budget model projects a \$25 million permanent salary appropriation surplus, which will likely fall to the fund balance. The

net increase across all funds, everything included, is 61 employees.

Currently the water quality fund 477 has 50 active employees, which is a net reduction of one from the beginning of the year. And the police district has a projected \$1.5 million surplus in salary appropriations.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Gail, question. We had a police class last year, was it? Or was it the year before? Yeah, everybody's looking around.

MS. VIZZINI:

We'll get that for you. This police class started in September ••

P.O. LINDSAY:

Last September.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

All right.

MS. VIZZINI:

•• this class of 100.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

So we're 150 positions above where we were at the beginning of the year.

MS. VIZZINI:

140.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

140.

MS. VIZZINI:

In the General Fund.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

In the General Fund.

MS. VIZZINI:

Right.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

All right.

MS. VIZZINI:

Only 61 across all funds.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

That's since the beginning of the year.

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

But what about in comparison to last year? Are we over, under, about the same? This time last year?

MS. VIZZINI:

We can get that for you.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay. You don't have to get it today, Gail. Any questions?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yeah, we are over but we just don't know how much.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Everybody has a question. Okay. I first noticed Legislator Schneiderman. And then I heard from Legislator Cooper. Then I noticed Legislator Alden and Legislator Vilorio•Fisher. So we're going to break this up that way.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm just trying to follow what's happening within the Police Department based on your bulletin. It looks to me like the number of active police officers is •• will be going down; currently and in the future. Am I reading that correctly? So right now I'm seeing 2634, and then by 2007 •• July 2007 you're down to 2550.

MS. VIZZINI:

From 2001 to the present, yes. The number of active sworn was 2595. If we have the same number of retirements that we usually expect, 35 to 50, we will be at an average of 2550.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

But the answer then to the question is yes, the number of police are going down as we move into the future?

MS. VIZZINI:

If we don't have a class in 2007.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there a class of 2007?

MS. VIZZINI:

I will know when the budget comes out.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right.

MS. VIZZINI:

And to answer Legislator Montano, there was a class in 2005. 120 in September 2005.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And population wise? I can't imagine we're shrinking in population within the police district. So we're ••

MS. VIZZINI:

County wide there's a marginal increase in population.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. You had a decrease in the number of police officers? It just seems like that's •• incongruent •• that we ought, you know, be keeping pace with our population growth.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, understand, too, that there is a step towards civilianization in the police department that the Legislature has supported in the budget. And theoretically, as more police officers are moved outside of positions that can be done by civilians, that there is a certain leveling off. But it certainly is something to watch and to be assured that there should be a continued class of recruits each year.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

But if what you're saying is true, then we'd be seeing the increases in the General •• no, we wouldn't. It still would be police fund but it wouldn't be active. And those numbers aren't here? Police fund but not active officers?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, we're not sure what you're asking.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if you're saying there's increased civilianization, and basically they're still County employees But they're not peace officers •• police officers, they're still going to show up in the budget somewhere as positions. And it ought to be in the police district budget.

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes. But these are active. These are people on the payroll.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Because, all right ••

MS. VIZZINI:

As opposed to authorized positions.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And your other number refers to the positions across all the funds so it includes the police district as well?

MS. VIZZINI:

And that's 61 across all funds, yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Is it me?

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

No. It's Legislator Cooper's next. Followed by Legislator Alden, and then you, Vivian.

LEG. COOPER:

Just to follow up on Legislator Schneiderman's •• Hello? Is this mike on? Just to follow up on Legislator Schneiderman's question, so you do not have information on the number of civilians that were added to the police department to offset the number of retired police officer •• uniformed officers? I'm just trying to determine whether in the aggregate is it the same number of personnel or ••

MS. VIZZINI:

There's •• we do track the civilian positions. And right now there's 601, which is give or take with, you know, maybe we're 20 ahead of the average where we have been over the past two years.

LEG. COOPER:

That's within the Police Department?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes. So that is indicative of a step in the right direction. We are trying for the operating budget to ascertain from the department precisely how many positions formerly performed by police officers are now civilianized functions. But the tracking of the actual positions is a little difficult.

LEG. COOPER:

All right. And also the net loss of 21 employees in the Labor Department,

that, I assume, was due to retirement?

MS. VIZZINI:

Attrition in general. As you know, the Labor Department was undergoing some downsizing in and of itself. The reduction in certain employment programs, federal funding associated with them. They have an ongoing effort to try to place people in other departments; transfer them as far as practicable but still run their programs. So it's a combination of attrition, retirement, transfers out.

LEG. COOPER:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

The fund 477, that's 50 active employees. Were more people transferred from the Labor Department into 477 as in the past?

MS. VIZZINI:

Not in 2006. Just what we did when the •• there was concerns about the Labor Department funding. And those employees were transferred to 477.

LEG. ALDEN:

So when you say a net reduction of two for the year; 477 in 2005 had about 50 active employees?

MS. VIZZINI:

In the beginning of the year we were probably at 52. We think this is just also attrition.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay. And then through the budget, you're going to have an analysis of, you know, like cash flow in and how much of that cash flow is a •• is being soaked up just with permanent employees ••

MS. VIZZINI:

Oh, absolutely yes.

LEG. ALDEN:

•• that type of thing? Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

We'll do an analysis of 477 and the fund balance. How much is committed to institutional costs, personnel, etcetera. And how much is available.

LEG. ALDEN:

Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Legislator Viloría • Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

My questions have been answered. Thank you.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I wanted to say something else.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Go ahead Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Getting back to the police issue. I know your numbers here seem to indicate the number of sworn police officers are down. But you're acting on the assumption that 35 to 50 are going to retire, which has been the norm. But you're not acting on the assumption that we're going to hire somebody. I mean, we've been hiring 100, roughly 100 police officers for the last couple of years.

MS. VIZZINI:

Absolutely, which is my comment. When we receive the operating budget we'll be looking to assure that ••

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, but your numbers here show that the Police Department in '07 will be down. You don't know that.

MS. VIZZINI:

No, we don't. It does make that assumption but we won't know until we get the operating budget.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, it makes the assumption on the retirements, but not the hires. That's my point here.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay. Are there any further comments, questions? Good morning, Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay. I'm going to move right into the agenda then. First we'll deal with the tabled resolutions.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

1523, amending the 2006 Operating Budget and transferring funds to Pederson•Krag Mental Health Center. (Mystal) I'm going to make a motion to table.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Motion tabled •• resolution **tabled**
(Tabled. Vote: 7•0)

IR 1658, Electing a cents per gallon rate of sales and compensating use taxes on motor fuel and diesel fuel, in lieu of the percentage rate of such taxes, pursuant to the authority of Article 29 of the Tax Law of the State of New York. (Romaine)

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion to table. Do I hear a second?

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

All in favor of tabling? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ALDEN:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

One opposition. No abstentions. The motion to table is carried. **(Tabled. VOTE: 6 • 1. Opposed Legislator Alden)**

IR 1788, a Common Sense Cost Mitigating Offset Plan for the cents •per gallon sales tax. (Losquadro)

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Do I hear a second? I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ALDEN:

Opposed.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Two opposed? Two opposed. Any abstentions? Motion to table carries.
(Tabled. VOTE: 5•2. Opposed Legislators Alden and Losquadro)

IR 1815, Establishing a Program to Reduce Unfair Home Energy Nuisance Taxes on Suffolk County Residents. (Alden)

LEG. ALDEN:

Motion to table for one cycle.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.
(Tabled. VOTE: 7•0)

IR 1816, Repealing home energy nuisance taxes on Suffolk County residents (Alden). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Motion to table carries. **(Tabled. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 1931, Repealing sales and compensating use taxes on biodiesel

fuel used for home heating. (Romaine)

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion to table. I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. **(Tabled. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 1985, Of the Suffolk County Legislature electing a cents per gallon rate of sales and compensating use taxes on motor fuel and diesel fuel, in lieu of the percentage rate of such taxes, with a \$3.00 cap, pursuant to the authority of Article 29 of the Tax Law of the State of New York. (Schneiderman)

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman. Second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Motion carries.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I vote no.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion carries. One opposition, Legislator D'Amaro. **(Tabled. VOTE: 6•1. Opposed Legislator D'Amaro)**

IR 2024, Adopting offsets in connections with cap on gasoline sales tax. (Schneiderman)

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Motion carries. **(Tabled. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2029, Adopting Local Law No •2006, A Charter Law to simplify and clarify Operating and Capital Budget Property Tax Impact Statements. (Co. Exec.)

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion to approve.

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Second by Legislator Alden. Any discussion?

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Yes, I'd like ••

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Go ahead, Legislator Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

At the public hearing when I asked Budget Review as to our receiving •• what we have always called the Melvin, which is an analysis of how •• what the impact would be on •• is my mike not working? Okay. I'll just speak very closely. Bob, you said we wouldn't be getting that if this law •• if this were passed?

MR. LIPP:

Correct. That wouldn't be a requirement anymore. Our •• Budget Review's position on this is that as was stated by the County Executive's Office at the public hearing, it's a little bit confusing as to what the town by town effects would be.

So for instance, if you pass a property tax that had a zero change for instance, there would still be some increases, some decreases. And that would be based upon state methodology on how they calculate the full equalized value of property. The important thing from our perspective is that because that is true, it becomes increasingly more important that Legislators have the information on a town by town basis as to exactly what's going to happen.

So for instance, if you have a property tax change of zero and that's what you believe to be the case, perhaps in your town there may be an increase and you may get constituents coming in shocked and appalled. It would be a good idea if you had that information beforehand so you would know what the reasons were.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Are you done? No.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Now the towns, however, produce the same information. I mean we could get the information from the towns because it's based on how they're assessing the valuation of the properties; isn't it?

MR. LIPP:

The homeowners get the information from their tax bills from the towns. And on that •• on the tax bills include the County portion.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Okay, thank you, Robert.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Legislator Alden followed by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. ALDEN:

Robert, I guess you're the expert on this. So I'm going to direct the question through the Chair to you. The town and a lot of actions by the town •• for instance, if they under value their property in one year, and they have a lot of tax certiorari cases, doesn't that •• and they lose a lot of tax certiorari or settle them, can't that lead to a huge disparity in the next year's tax bill?

MR. LIPP:

Yes, it could. But for the last several years the tax certiorari cases which are the changes in the assessed value that are grieved and in particular they show up on a tax bill as an erroneous assessment, for the last several years they're segregated to a separate line item on the tax bills. So they don't show up under the County portion ••

LEG. ALDEN:

Right.

MR. LIPP:

- any longer.

LEG. ALDEN:

The actions themselves don't. But the overall effect of that action does. Because it can make either your tax base shrink or expand in the year. And can do it in gross amounts, actually.

MR. LIPP:

Yes. You could have a significant change presumably in your tax bill based upon the tax certiorari cases or in your assessments in the tax bill. But it would show up as part of your overall tax bill. And if you're reading the bill as a property owner you wouldn't associate that directly to the County though.

LEG. ALDEN:

So what is this actually do then? There's the two things that we vote on. We vote on a budget that overall County wide it either increases or decreases taxes. And then secondly is their warrant that we vote on that either increases or decreases taxes. And that would be on a town by town basis. So where's the dividing line as far as this action?

MR. LIPP:

With this particular resolution we would wind up calculating •• continue to calculate an average tax impact County wide. It would no longer be on a town by town basis, however. When we adopt a tax warrant after the budget is adopted, as you had correctly stated, it's a separate warrant for each of the

ten towns. And as a result of that, you could calculate a separate average tax bill for each of the ten towns. So when you're adopting the budget you see the total.

So for instance, in an example before if there was no change in property tax, you would assume that therefore the average person would have no change in property tax. But there can be pluses or minuses because of the way the taxes are portioned, by town.

LEG. ALDEN:

Well, as a County Legislator, I want to see what we're doing and how that affects, you know, my constituents and I'm sure that every other Legislator would want to see that. In a way what we're cutting out here is actions above and beyond things that we can actually have any cause or effect on.

MR. LIPP:

Oh most definitely. You're correct there. But the point that was being made was that it's important for you, in our opinion, to have that information so that you're not lulled into a false sense of security; that if there was no change in the property tax that perhaps in your town it may go up or down.

LEG. ALDEN:

And that's a math function that you can do very quickly and easily, right? At a meeting when we're debating that resolution that would either approve or disapprove a budget.

MR. LIPP:

There is a process that we have to go through that takes several hours. A large spread sheet have to be updated; several days actually. If this bill is passed, the implication is you're not interested.

LEG. ALDEN:

Well formerly, it takes you off the hook formerly to do that. But on a request by a Legislator you'd still have to do it. Or you should be doing it. On a question and answered period. Right?

MR. LIPP:

Correct. If we're requested by the Legislature to do it for sure we would do that. The point to be made here though is if you •• if you're in favor of passing this, the •• on the surface implication is you're not interested.

LEG. ALDEN:

All right. I'd •• all right. I would debate with you, but ••

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Yeah. I'm not going to debate it either. Thank you, Legislator Alden. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I think there's an important distinction here to be made. It's one thing to have an opinion that we should have the information and whether or not we should. I think each individual Legislator can decide for themselves. It's another thing to make it a charter requirement, which just leads to confusion as to what we're responsible for.

So, you know, I find it interesting that we're debating the bill you. When we seem to feel that it's leading to confusion and certainly it makes it seem like I'm accountable for something that's beyond my own control.

LEG. ALDEN:

Can I define quickly?

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

All right. I'm going •• Legislator Viloría•Fisher wants to make a quick comment. But I'll let you respond quickly.

LEG. VILORIA•FISHER:

Just based on what you said, your conversation with Legislator Alden, we would be seeing the impact on the towns when we vote on the warrant.

MR. LIPP:

The answer to that is number one it's after the adopted budget.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Right. Okay.

MR. LIPP:

Number two, you're looking at a •• just a total number of several million dollars. You're are not seeing what ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

The impact on the homeowner.

MR. LIPP:

•• correct. And I will apologize if it was construed that I was trying to debate. I was just trying to provide the information as to what the pluses and are minuses were.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Thank you. Legislator Alden.

LEG. ALDEN:

That was my point too. I don't mind them coming up with their opinion because they're number crunches, and they really want us to have, you know, like every last little thing.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

What's the saying; they're not potted plants. We get it.

LEG. ALDEN:

Right. But my point would be as Legislator D'Amaro pointed out, you know, like that's above and beyond our control.

MR. LIPP:

Right.

LEG. ALDEN:

Why would we want to confuse the issue? If we're trying to accomplish something, you know, let it be accomplished.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Thank you. All right. We have a motion to approve. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries? **(Approved. VOTE: 7•0)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

IR 2045, Adopting Local Law No •2006 A Charter Law to provide for fair and equitable distribution of public safety sales and compensating use tax revenues. (Romaine)

I'm going to make a motion to table.

LEG. COOPER:

Second.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I was going to make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Did you make a motion to approve?

LEG. COOPER:

I believe it has to be tabled for a public hearing.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Okay. Do you want me to withdraw the motion to approve?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, yours takes precedence anyway.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Takes precedence. Okay. We have a motion to table. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries. **(Tabled. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2054, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer (by: County Legislature # 252.) (Co. Exec.)

I'm going to make a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. If you don't mind I'm going to go through these in order. I mean with the same motion, same second. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Motion carries. **(Approved. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2055, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer (by: County Legislature # 253.) (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2056, To readjust, compromise, and grant funds and chargebacks on real property correction of errors by: County Legislature Control (# 756•2006.) (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second, and same vote. **(Approved. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2057, To readjust compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature (# 254.) (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2058, To readjust, compromise, and grant refunds and chargebacks on correction or errors/County Treasurer by: County Legislature (# 255.) (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. VOTE: 7•0)**

IR 2077, Authorizing the County Treasurer to borrow cash funds from other County funds for 2006. (Lindsay)

Do I have a motion?

LEG. COOPER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Motion to approve. Do I have a second?

LEG. ALDEN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN MONTANO:

Second by Legislator Alden. Any discussion? Take a vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Motion carries. Being no further business of the committee, I hereby adjourn it.

(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10:15 AM)

{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY